

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached drawing replacement sheets include changes to Figures 1-5, to address the drawing objections by the Office. The attached drawing replacement sheets are submitted to replace the original drawing sheets that include Figures 1-5. Formal
5 drawings are being prepared and will be submitted to the Office upon receipt from the draftsman.

Attachment: (5) Drawing Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 28, 2006, and within the three-month period for response extending to September 28, 2006.

The current status of the claims is summarized as follows:

- 5 • Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 14-16, 20-21, 24-25, 32, 34-38 are currently amended.
- Claims 1-39 are pending in the application after entry of the present Amendment.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

10 Claims 1-4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rand et al. ("Rand" hereafter) (U.S. Patent No. 6,459,374). These rejections are traversed.

Rand teaches an anti-theft computer security system. With regard to Figure 1 of Rand, the security system includes a USB connector (10) connected to a cable (20). Cable (20) is connected via connector (21) to a port (31) of a central alarm monitoring unit (30).

15 The USB connector (10) is connected to a USB of a computer to be protected from theft. The USB connector (10) includes a sensor to detect when the USB connector (10) is disconnected from the computer. The cable (20) includes four wires that are used to implement the security features associated with the system.

 It should be understood that the cable (20) and USB connector (10) are defined
20 specifically to implement the anti-theft computer security system. Thus, the cable (20) and USB connector (10) are not equipped to transmit information technology (IT) network signals between IT network connected devices. Specifically, the USB connector (10) of Rand does not teach a network cable connector defined to enable connection of an IT network cable to an IT network connected device, such that IT network signals can be

transmitted between the IT network connected device and the IT network cable through the network cable connector, as recited in amended claim 1.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102, the prior art reference must teach each and every feature of the claim. As discussed above, Rand fails to teach each and every feature of amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Rand under 35 U.S.C. 102. The Office is requested to withdraw the rejection of amended claim 1.

Each of dependent claims 2-4 and 7 incorporates each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, each of claims 2-4 and 7 is patentable for at least the same reasons provided for claim 1. The Office is requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 2-4 and 7.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12-19, 22-32, and 35-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rand in view of Billiard (U.S. Patent No. 6,842,114). These rejections are traversed.

With regard to claim 14, the Office has asserted that Rand teaches each recited feature other than the operation for receiving an interrogation signal from a connection state monitoring utility. The Office has asserted that Billiard teaches the operation for receiving an interrogation signal from a connection state monitoring utility.

The teachings of Rand are discussed above with regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102. Billiard teaches an electronic wire-based safety device for the detection of a theft of an object to be protected. The device of Billiard includes a detector connected by a wire-based electrical link to a signaling unit. The detector exhibits a first electrical status when it is attached to the object to be protected. The detector exhibits a second electrical status when it is detached from the object to be protected. The electrical status

exhibited by the detector is transmitted through the wire-based electrical link to the signaling unit. The signaling unit compares the electrical status received from the detector through the wire-based electrical link to a threshold to determine whether the electrical status represents an unauthorized detachment of the detector from the object to be
5 protected.

It should be understood that the detector, wire-based electrical link, and signaling unit of Billiard are defined specifically to implement the safety device for the detection of a theft of an object to be protected. The detector and wire-based electrical link are not equipped to transmit information technology (IT) network signals between IT network
10 connected devices. Specifically, the detector of Billiard does not teach a network cable connector within an IT network. Moreover, the wire-based electrical link of Billiard does not represent an IT network cable.

In considering the combined teachings of Rand and Billiard with regard to claim 14, the Applicant submits that neither Rand nor Billiard teach a method for detecting an
15 IT network cable connection state. Specifically, the combination of Rand and Billiard fails to teach detecting a state change of a network cable connector within an IT network using a contact sensor that resides in the network cable connector. Additionally, because the security systems of Rand and Billiard are self-contained and not associated with an IT network, it follows that the combination of Rand and Billiard does not teach receiving an
20 interrogation signal at the network cable connector from a connection state monitoring utility within the IT network. Also, the combination of Rand and Billiard does not teach communicating connection state information from the network cable connector through the IT network to the connection monitoring utility using a network communication protocol.

As discussed above with regard to claims 1 and 14, the security systems disclosed by the Rand and Billiard references are not associated with an information technology (IT) network. Therefore, neither the USB connector disclosed in the Rand reference nor the detector disclosed in the Billiard reference teach an IT network cable connector, as
5 recited in amended claim 24.

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). As discussed above, the combination of Rand and Billiard fails to teach each and every feature of amended claims 14 and 24, respectively. Therefore,
10 each of claims 14 and 24 are not rendered prima facie obvious by the combination of Rand and Billiard. The Office is requested to withdraw the rejections of amended claims 14 and 24.

Each of dependent claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12-13, 15-19, 22-23, 25-32, and 35-39 incorporates each and every feature of its respective independent claim. Therefore, each
15 of claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12-13, 15-19, 22-23, 25-32, and 35-39 is patentable for at least the same reasons provided for its independent claim. The Office is requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 12-13, 15-19, 22-23, 25-32, and 35-39.

Claims 10, 11, 20, 21, 33, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
20 unpatentable over Rand in view of Billiard and further in view of Laor (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,331). These rejections are traversed.

Each of dependent claims 10, 11, 20, 21, 33, and 34 incorporates each and every feature of its respective independent claim. Therefore, each of claims 10, 11, 20, 21, 33, and 34 is patentable for at least the same reasons provided for its independent claim. The
25 Office is requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 10, 11, 20, 21, 33, and 34.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6914. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP467). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Kenneth D. Wright
Reg. No. 53,795

Martine Penilla & Gencarella, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94086
Tel: (408) 749-6900
Customer Number 32,291